

REMARKS

Claims 1-36 are currently pending in the present application. All pending claims are subject to restriction as indicated in the Office Action.

The Restriction Requirement:

In the Office Action, the Examiner requires the election of a single disclosed invention from among the following groups:

Group I, claims 1-27, drawn to methods of making a deep drawn product;

Group II, claims 28-31, drawn to sputtering targets;

Group III, claims 32 and 33, drawn to finite element calculations;
and

Group IV, claim 34-36, drawn to methods of making a plate.

The Examiner contends that the inventions listed as Groups I-IV do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1, not for any reason related to lack of a contribution over the prior art, but rather, because there is no special technical feature common to all four Groups. (See, the Office Action, pp. 2-3).

Provisional Election with Traverse:

In the event the Examiner is inclined to maintain the Restriction Requirement despite the traversal remarks which follow, Applicant provisionally elects, *with traverse*, the invention of **Group II, claims 28-31**, for prosecution on the merits.

Traversal:

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's basis for requiring restriction in this application is improper. Applicant respectfully submits that *at least* Groups I, II and IV have a special technical feature under PCT Rule 13.2 linking the inventions under one general inventive concept in accordance with PCT Rule 13.1. *Accordingly, at least Groups I, II and IV should be examined simultaneously.*

The invention of Group IV is directed to processes for making a plate. The invention of Group I is directed to processes for making a pot which processes include all of the elements of the invention of Group IV, with an *additional* element of deep drawing the plate to form a pot. Thus, the elements of the processes set forth in Group IV, *e.g.*, claim 34, are included in and common to Group I. Moreover, Group II is directed to sputtering targets which comprise a pot prepared by a recited process and a collar attached to the pot. The process of forming the pot of Group II includes all of the elements of the processes of Group I. Accordingly, again, the elements of the processes set forth in Group IV, *e.g.*, claim 34, are included in and common to Group II.

Thus, in other words, the inventions of Groups I, II and IV all have the special technical feature of Group IV as a general inventive concept linking the inventions. Accordingly, restriction of Groups I, II and IV is improper on the basis set forth by the Examiner in the Office Action.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that simultaneous examination of Groups I-IV will present no undue burden on the Examiner given the commonalities among the four groups. Any search of the claimed processes of Group IV will likely cover the other groups.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's Restriction Requirement and requests reconsideration, and substantive examination of all pending claims on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER R. JEPSON

June 8, 2009
(Date)

By: _____

AARON R. ETTELMAN

Registration No. 42,516

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1007 North Orange Street

P.O. Box 2207

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302) 888-6435

(302) 658-5614

aettelman@cblh.com